

REMARKS

In the final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,724 to Lowry et al. ("*Lowry*"). In the present Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 21, and 22.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-22 as allegedly being anticipated by *Lowry*. *Lowry* fails to disclose each and every element of any of claims 1-22, as required to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For example, *Lowry* at least fails to teach the claimed "first area including the second area to indicate an inclusion relationship between [a] parent class and [a] child class," as recited in claim 1.

Lowry discloses a chart with "[n]odes 52 that are at different hierarchical levels 54 and are linked by branches 56 [and] are sometimes referred to as having parent/child relationships" (*Lowry*, col. 4, lines 61-63). *Lowry* also discloses that the chart can be built using graphic objects, such as those provided in various object-oriented programming languages (*Lowry*, col. 14, lines 61-65), and discloses a graphical interface for managing the chart (*Lowry*, col. 7, lines 43-47, FIG. 5A). However, neither the chart nor the graphical interface in *Lowry* uses a first area including a second area to indicate any sort of inclusion relationship. *Lowry*, therefore,

¹ The Office Action contains statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

fails to teach or suggest the claimed “first area including the second area to indicate an inclusion relationship between [a] parent class and [a] child class,” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the Examiner apparently contends that nodes 52 of the alleged “hierarchical structure” shown in Fig. 2A of *Lowry* constitute parent and child classes. Final Office Action at pages 3-4. Fig. 2A, however, clearly shows nodes 52 being spaced from one another. None of nodes 52 is shown as being included within another node. Similarly, FIG. 5A of *Lowry* has “node lines 98,” which represent the nodes in the chart, but none of the node lines are included within each other. Accordingly, *Lowry* does not teach or suggest the claimed “first area including the second area” at least for this reason.

Moreover, Applicants note that the Examiner further contends that *Lowry* teaches “a display configured to output at least part of a ‘first area of the one class and at least part of a second area of the child class... the first area including the second area” and cites to various portions of *Lowry* in support of this assertion. Final Office Action at page 4. None of the cited portions, however, discloses the claimed “first area [of a parent class] including the second area [of a child class].” For example, the cited portion at col. 5, lines 66-67 merely teaches that “[a] form displays information in formats other than as hierarchical graphical listing” but is silent as to display of the claimed “first area” including a “second area.” Also, the cited portion at col. 6, lines 39-43 discloses “displaying a particular file type,” but does not disclose how the file type is displayed. In addition, the cited portion at col. 7, lines 19-28 discusses chart 50,

which, as noted above in regard to Fig. 2A, shows nodes 52 spaced from one another. Lastly, the cited portion at col. 10, lines 15-31 discloses type fields 128, which, as shown in Fig. 6, are provided in separate table entries and, therefore, apparently have associated display areas which are spaced from one another. See also Fig. 7A. There is no teaching in *Lowry* of displaying such areas within each other. Accordingly, *Lowry* fails to teach the claimed "first area" including a "second area" for this additional reason.

Amended claim 1 is, therefore, allowable over *Lowry* and claims 2-20 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Claims 21 and 22, while of different scope, recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Claims 21 and 22, therefore, are allowable at least for reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allow the claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Application No. 10/717,707
Attorney Docket No. 05225.0253-00

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 8, 2007

By: Richard V. Burgujian Reg. No. 53,232
for Reg. No. 31,744